

STATINTL

Oversight Of CIA

IT GOES AGAINST the grain, with most Americans to have any government agency that does not account to Congress in detail for its operations. Yet one must agree with Allen Dulles, former director of the Central Intelligence Agency that its situation is unique. An intelligence service cannot function in a goldfish bowl. It would break down completely if it were obliged to disclose how it spends its money, who are its employees, how they are recruiting and what the various facets of its operations cost. The CIA's sources of information would dry up quickly if it were obliged to operate with an open budget.

This, of course, means that members of Congress have to take a great deal on faith. They have to assume that the CIA really needs the money requested for its operations. They have to assume that the agency is being conducted efficiently and without extravagance. This does not mean there is no control from the legislative branch. Congress does get some information on which to base an appraisal of the scope and the competence of the work carried on by the CIA.

There is another question concerning the CIA, however, that merits re-examination. That is the matter of its conducting actual operations, such as the direct participation it had in preparing Cuban refugee troops for the ill-fated Bay of Pigs invasion. That was not a proper intelligence function. To do the best possible job in gathering, analyzing and collating intelligence data, and then making them available to the military and

civil agencies that need them, the CIA should not be involved in the conduct of any military or paramilitary operations of any kind.

It is quite within the province of the Congress, in approving the CIA budget, to specify that its activities be limited to strictly intelligence functions. This it could do without risking any disclosure of the necessarily classified information relating to the CIA, its organization, methods and sources.